



CT Against Gun Violence

P.O. Box 523 Southport, CT 06890
tel: 203-955-1009
www.cagv.org

**Testimony to the Judiciary Committee
Ron Pinciaro, Executive Director**

CT Against Gun Violence (CAGV) supports HB7028

HB 7028 as amended would permit parole officers access to the firearms database and would also require the holder of a pistol carry permit to present such permit upon request of a law enforcement officer. We support both of these sections.

Parole officers have a responsibility to investigate and verify important criminal or other background information about parolees who they are charged with supervising. Purchase or possession of firearms certainly would fall into the category of necessary information to which they would be entitled without violating a person's rights or privileges. Just one type of example where this would be advantageous, aside from the parole officers obvious need to know, would be if a person who should be prohibited was inadvertently left off of the prohibited list. California recently ran a match of their database of prohibited users against their database of gun owners and found 20,000 matches!

HB 7028 also offers a specific statutory clarification that should be enacted requiring a holder of a pistol carry permit to present such permit upon request of an officer. Confusion may often arise because some permit holders believe that their Second Amendment right precludes them from having to present this information. The misunderstanding and any related consequences could be avoided if the permit holder was informed that the officer had statutory authority to ask to see the permit. When

a firearm is found to be in a person's possession, officer's need to know if the person has a valid permit to carry the firearm as the permit to carry outside the home is required by law. Since the permit is required to be carried on the person when taking a pistol or revolver outside the person's home or office, that requirement would be moot if an officer could not ask to see if the person was in fact complying with the requirement.

In no case is the officer's request more invasive than a request to see a driver's operator license or a request to see identification when voting. To deny this authority also has the additional consequence of not allowing law enforcement to identify prohibited users who are in unlawful possession of firearms or persons who may have an eligibility certificate but not a permit to carry. To have a permitting process without enforcement authority is not sensible or practical.

The question of Constitutionality has also been raised but the authority exists in a number of other states, some of which are: Kansas: § 75-7c03; Michigan § 28.425f; NC Gen. Stat. § 14-415.11. Oklahoma -SB 1733; VA Sec. 18.2-308. No constitutional challenges have been successfully brought against these statutes or states.